UCWDC® SCORING FORMAT:
HEATING, SCORING, & REPORTING RULES
(v15, 2020©: to be used for the 2023-2025 Rules)

For all UCWDC® contests, the **_UCWDC® "Majority Rules" Scoring Format_** must be used. All contest practices and procedures, to include heating, balloting, scrutineering, scoring, auditing, and reporting of this format will be supervised by a UCWDC®-"certified" Contest Coordinator, with UCWDC®-"verified" Scoring Director(s) and/or UCWDC®-"verified" Scrutineer(s), using a vetted and verified UCWDC®-"authorized" Scoring System, according to the following rules:

Rule #0 – Heating Rules:

1. If space, time, and circumstance allow, a heat of competition will be comprised of only those contestants that are in the same division. Each division's contestants must be randomized by the scoring system to insure fairness in access to the arena floor.

2. If a division requires more than 1 heat, then the difference in the total size of contestants per heat shall be no more than 1. When multiple heats are required for a singular division, the division when necessary may be 'co-mingled' with other divisions, providing the heats size-difference relative to a divisions 'co-mingled' contestants remains no more than 1.

3. When a division requires multiple heats, those heats must be run in a 'contiguous' order, one right after another.

4. Whenever possible, multiple heats for a single division that have different sizes, the lesser size shall precede the greater size as this helps facilitate scratches giving contest officials the ability to move up contestants to continually re-balance the heats for fairness.

5. If space, time, and circumstance require, all heats may be "co-mingled" with multiple divisions in a heat. In each case of "co-mingling" heats, balancing each singular division across the heats is recommended as being the fairest method of heating.

6. At times, "co-mingling" occurs in the case of ProAm, because one instructor, or Pro, has multiple students in a singular division. If the singular division cannot "house" these multiple students within its heats, then some of those students may then be heated as "outliers" in other heats beyond their parent division, providing they are heated contiguously.

7. Regardless of the divisional makeup for "co-mingling" for efficiency, were one or more of the divisions are heated in multiple heats, the difference in the total size of the heats containing a singular division shall be no more than 1 (to include the "co-mingled" contestants), and for each singular division, the heats must still be run in a "contiguous" order.

Rule #1 – Preliminaries Rounds to determine Semi-Finalists:

1. A Preliminary Round, by definition, will "graduate" contestants to the Semi-Final Round rather than eliminate them. All remaining contestants are then eligible to dance one or more additional Preliminary Rounds to again attempt to make the Semi-Finals.

2. In a Preliminary Round on the ballot, each judge must circle a "Medals" mark for each contestant that they seek to graduate to the Semi-Finals, with marks given in ascending order: "HM" (or "M" on some ballots), "B", "S", "G", "GH" (or "H" on some ballots), or "GG". [Marks hereafter are designated and called as such: HM is "Honorable Mention"; B is "Bronze"; S is "Silver"; G is "Gold"; GH is "Gold with Honors"; and GG is "Gold Graduate".] All contestants need not be accounted for in these marks. Contestants not receiving a mark will automatically be given the lowest mark, an "HM". It is not necessary to rank these marks as ties are acceptable.

3. Rules #3 through #8 (the "single-dance" rules) are used to determine each contestant's placement in the dance category for this round of competition. Once the contestants are ranked by the marks in each dance, the Championship formula for the division in question will be used to graduate contestants to the next round. The top-ranked contestants, based on a designated number determined by the Contest Coordinator (plus ties, if any), are immediately placed into the Semi-Finals. Each category in which a contestant dances at least one Preliminary Round counts toward his or her Championship eligibility for the event being contested.

Rule #2 – Semi-Finals Rounds to determine Finalists:

1. A Semi-Final Round, by definition, will "eliminate" contestants, with the remaining contestants dancing either another Semi-Finals Round, until the number of contestants remaining according to the Contest Coordinator can constitute the Finals Round.

2. In a Semi-Final Round on the ballot, each judge must circle a "Medals" mark for each contestant they seek to send to the Finals, with marks given in ascending order: "HM" (or "M" on some ballots), "B", "S", "G", "GH" (or "H" on some ballots), or "GG". All contestants need not be accounted for in the marks. Contestants not receiving a mark will automatically be given the lowest medal, an "HM". It is not necessary to rank these marks as ties are acceptable.

3. Rules #3 through #8 (the "single-dance" rules) are used to determine each contestant's placement in the dance category for this round of competition. Once the contestants are ranked by the marks in each dance, the Championship formula for the division in question will be used to eliminate contestants from the next round. The bottom-ranked contestants, based on a designated number

determined by the Contest Coordinator (plus ties, if any) are eliminated from Finals consideration. Each round of Semi-Finals will eliminate contestants from the bottom of the placement rankings. Each category in which a contestant dances at least one Semi-Finals Round counts toward his or her Championship eligibility for the event being contested.

Rule #3 – Finals Round, determining the results from the *majority mark*:

1. In the Finals Round on the ballot, each judge must circle a "Medals" mark for each contestant, with marks given in ascending order: "HM" (or "M" on some ballots), "B", "S", "G", "GH" (or "H" on some ballots), or "GG". For ProAm Dance, after circling a mark, it is not necessary to rank the marks as ties are acceptable. For Couples Dance or Line Dance, if a circled mark is the same for more than one contestant, then the mark must then be ranked, with the lowest number ("1", or 1st) being the higher rank.

2. "Medals" marks are converted to placements as follows: A higher "Medals" mark always defeats a lower "Medals" mark (for example, "G" always defeats "S"). If the same "Medals" mark is used more than once on a ballot, the marks are ranked by the judge from first ("1") to last. A "Medals" mark with a lower number value always defeats the same "Medals" mark with a higher number value (for example, "G3" defeats "G4", or "G5" defeats "G10"). When "Medals" marks and their ranks are examined together, "G9" defeats "S1". Judges must not tie contestants in Couples Dance or Line Dance contests.

3. "Medals" marks for Couples Dance and Line Dance are converted to designated number values as follows: "GG" = 1; "GH" = 2; "G" = 3, "S" = 4, "B" = 5, "HM" = 6. However, "Medals" marks for ProAm have "+" (plus) values for marks within the skill level (as determined by Judges' Methodology), that is, "GH" (Gold with Honors), "G" (Gold), and "S" (Silver). Therefore, for ProAm Dance, "Medals" marks are converted thusly: "GG" = 1; "GH+" = 2; "GH" = 3; "G+" = 4; "G" = 5; "S+" = 6; "S" = 7; "B" = 8; and "HM" = 9. For ProAm Dance, judges may tie contestants with their "Medals" marks, meaning they can give the same mark multiple times.

4. The *majority mark* of the judges, here in Rule #3, is the first determination of results for a "single-dance". To arrive at the *majority mark*, we use the following two steps. Step #1 is to have the marks arranged in a pre-determined judge order that will remain the same in the chart of the results for the entire divisional contest and will be known as the "*raw*" scores. The "*raw*" scores indicate each judge's marks consistently from one contestant to the next, one dance to the next, and included in this order must be each judge's name as revealed. Step #2 then re-arranges each contestant's marks so they become "*re-ordered*" scores by sorting them in ascending order from the best score to the worst score (*raw* scores: [3,1,2,5,4] will become *re-ordered* scores: [1,2,3,4,5]).

   The *majority mark* is always the *middle* mark (where a contestant gains their "*majority*") when using an odd number of judges. In the examples above that had 5 judges, the *majority mark* is "3". In the case of 7 judges the 4th mark is the *majority mark*, and for 9 judges the 5th mark is the *majority mark*, and for 11 judges the 6th mark is the *majority mark*. If an even number of judges is used for contingency or emergency purposes, then the *majority mark* is always one mark more than half the marks. For 6 judges, half the number of judges is 3 (which is not a "majority"), but the 4th mark would then represent the *majority mark*. In the case of 8 judges the 5th mark is the *majority mark*, and for 10 judges the 6th mark is the *majority mark*.

5. All *majority marks* where each contestant gains their "*majority*" are then sorted in ascending order, from the smallest number value (best "*mark*") to the largest number value (worst "*mark*"), from first, "1", to last. The smallest number value (or highest score) is the best *majority mark* and receives 1st place. The next larger number value (or lesser score) will be awarded 2nd place, and on and on, until all contestants in a dance are assigned a unique placement. If a tie persists after Rule #3 is fully executed, then proceed to Rule #4.

Rule #4 – 1st Tiebreaker, determining the *majority size* (to the 'right' of the *majority mark*):

1. In the case of a tie at Rule #3, the *majority size* for each contestant is determined by counting the number of marks to the 'right' of the *majority mark* that have a larger number value (or lesser score), for example, [1,2,3,4,5] has 2 marks that are of a higher number value than the *majority mark*; [2,2,3,3,4] has 1 mark that has a higher number value than the *majority mark*; and [3,3,3,3,3] has 0 marks that have a higher number value than the *majority mark*. Note that all three sample groups have the same *majority mark* of "3" (as determined by Rule #3).

2. The *majority size* for all the tied contestants is sorted in ascending order, from the smallest number value (which is the best "*size*") to the largest number value (which is the worst "*size*"). The smaller number value represents a greater *majority size*, that is, less marks that are at a higher number value than the *majority mark*. The contestant with the smaller *majority size* number value is awarded the higher placement. The contestant with the next larger number value will be awarded the next higher placement, and on and on, until all tied contestants are assigned a unique placement. If a tie persists after Rule #4 is fully executed, then proceed to Rule #5.

Rule #5 – 2nd Tiebreaker, determining the *majority sum* (to the 'left' of the *majority mark*):

1. In case of a tie at Rule #4, the *majority sum* for each contestant is determined by totaling the marks that are to the 'left' of the *majority mark*, for example, [1,2,3,4,5] has a totaled value of 3; [2,2,3,4,5] has a totaled value of 4; [2,3,3,4,5] has a totaled value of 5; and [3,3,3,4,5] has a totaled value of 6. Note that all four sample groups have the same *majority mark* of "3" (as determined by Rule #3) and the same *majority size* of "2" (as determined by Rule #4).

2. The *majority sum* for all the tied contestants is sorted in ascending order, from the smallest number value (best "*sum*") to the largest number value (worst "*sum*"). The smaller number value represents the better *majority sum*, given that the *majority mark* is the

same and the *majority size* is the same. The contestant with the smaller *majority sum* number value is awarded the higher placement. The contestant with the next larger number value will be awarded the next higher placement, and on and on, until all tied contestants are assigned a unique placement. If a tie persists after Rule #5 is fully executed, then proceed to Rule #6.

Rule #6 – 3rd Tiebreaker, determining *look-ahead* columns (to the 'right' of the *majority mark*):

1. In case of a tie at Rule #5, each contestant's *re-ordered* marks that are to the 'right' of the *majority mark* create a *look-ahead* number 'group' to be compared, column by column, for example, [1,2,3,4,4] has a *look-ahead* group of [4,4]; [1,2,3,4,5] has a *look-ahead* group of [4,5]; [1,2,3,5,5] has a *look-ahead* group of [5,5]. All three groups have the same *majority mark* of "3" (as determined by Rule #3); the same *majority size*, "2" (as determined by Rule #4); and the same *majority sum*, "3" (as determined by Rule #5).

2. When looking at each column of the *look-ahead* 'group' (with each successive mark so indicated as separated by a comma) from left to right, the first mark of each tied contestant creates a column of number values to be compared. The next mark in the *look-ahead* sequence creates a second column, with the next mark (if there is one) a third column, and on and on, until all marks (to the 'right' of the *majority mark*) for all tied contestants are each placed in a column of values. Each column is considered one at a time from left to right and sorted in ascending order from the smallest number value (which is the best *"mark"*) to the largest number value (worst *"mark"*).

    When the first column of the *look-ahead* is compared, if the tied contestants have the same mark, the next column is then compared. If the marks are still the same, the next column (if there is one) is compared, until each column of values to the "right" of the *majority mark* has been compared after finding the previous column's marks to be the same. When looking at any single column of values and comparing marks in sequence, the contestant with the smaller *look-ahead* number value is awarded the higher placement. The contestant with the next larger number value is awarded the next higher placement, and on and on, until all tied contestants are assigned a unique placement. If a tie persists after Rule #6 is fully executed, then proceed to Rule #7.

Rule #7 – 4th Tiebreaker, determining *look-behind* columns (to the 'left' of the *majority mark*):

1. In case of a tie at Rule #6, each contestant's *re-ordered* marks that are to the 'left' of the *majority mark*, create a *look-behind* number 'group' to be compared, column by column, for example, [1,3,3,4,5] has a *look-behind* group of [1,3]; [2,2,3,4,5] has a *look-behind* group of [2,2]. Both groups have the same *majority mark* of "3" (as determined by Rule #3); the same *majority size*, "2" (as determined by Rule #4); the same *majority sum*, "4" (as determined by Rule #5); and the same *look-ahead* of "4,5" (as determined by Rule #6).

2. When looking at each column of the *look-behind* group (with each successive mark so indicated as separated by a comma) from left to right, the first mark of each tied contestant creates a column of values to be compared. The next mark in the *look-behind* sequence creates a second column, with the next mark (if there is one) a third column, and on and on, until all marks (to the 'left' of the *majority mark*) for all tied contestants are each placed in a column of values. Each column is considered one at a time left to right and sorted in ascending order from the smallest number value (best *"mark"*) to the largest number value (worst *"mark"*).

    When the first column of the *look-behind* is compared, if the tied contestants have the same mark, the next column is then compared. If the marks are still the same, the next column (if there is one) is compared, until each column of values to the 'left' of the *majority mark* has been compared after finding the previous column's marks to be the same. When looking at any single column of values and comparing marks, the contestant with the smaller *look-behind* number value is awarded the higher placement. The contestant with the next larger number is awarded the next higher placement, and on and on, until all tied contestants are assigned a unique placement. If a tie persists after Rule #7 is fully executed, then proceed to Rule #8.

Rule #8 – 5th Tiebreaker, determining "Head-to-Head" results (that is, *wins/losses/ties* records) from individual judges' marks (with *re-visitation*); and if a *final tie*, determining a *carry-forward* value:

1. The final proof of a tie at Rule #7 is when the *re-ordered* marks for a "single-dance" initially (determined in Rule #3) yields a result where the tied contestants have the same identical judges' marks. If this is not true, a scoring error has occurred, and the previous rules must be re-calculated. If the marks are indeed identical, a tie still exists.

2. In case of a tie at Rule #7, only the tied contestants are now compared for *wins/losses/ties* between each contestants' marks on each judge's ballot. Within the group of tied contestants, a judge's mark for a specific contestant when compared with the mark for another tied contestant will either yield a *win*, or a *loss*, or a *tie* between the two contestants for that specific judge. That in turn will yield a record of *wins/losses/ties* across all tied contestants, each contestant against each other contestant in each judge's marks. Please note, in *wins/losses/ties* the "numeric" difference in the marks is not considered, but only whether it was a *win*, or a *loss*, or a *tie*. Like in other sports, the number of wins, losses, and ties against the competition reads like a record for the contestant in question, that is, 4 wins, 3 losses, and 0 ties reads as a record of 4-3-0, which then is higher than the record of 3-4-0, where more wins are attained by the first contestant. A record of 11-7-4, is higher than the record of 11-8-3, where fewer losses and more ties are attained by the first contestant. In all cases the total number of wins, losses, and ties for each contestant in the tied contestant group should be the same. If this is not true, a scoring error has occurred, and the *wins/losses/ties* should be re-calculated.

    While these above examples of contestant records are easy to comprehend, when the number of contests or "games played" is great and diverse, and ties are involved (with most likely 3 or more contestants tied, as sometimes happens in ProAm dance), then the placements can be visually difficult to determine. So, A numeric recording of *wins/losses/ties* will be done by computing either

the *"win"* percentage, or the *"loss"* percentage, depending on whether the reporting is to show the "highest" or the "lowest" value as the best score in the reporting format. Reporting is shown as a 3-place decimal value [".xxx"], either as a *"win"* percentage or a *"loss"* percentage that when, for audit purposes, they are added together equals a total of "1.000". Where considering the highest *"win"* value, a ".667" is better than a ".600", and where considering the lowest *"loss"* value, a ".333" is better than a ".400". When computing either *"wins"*, *"losses"*, and *"ties"* into a numeric values, note that *"ties"* are a numeric 'push' between contestants and are therefore computed as *"half of a win"* and *"half of a loss"* where the total number of "games played" remains the same. When a 'partial' percentage occurs, the 3-place decimal value is either rounded up or down as the case may be, with a 'half' of a percentage point [".xxx5"] being rounded up for a "win" percentage, and rounded down for a "loss" percentage.

For the <u>UCWDC® *"Majority Rules" Scoring Format*</u>, when the <u>wins/losses/ties</u> records of the tied contestants are compared, a new number based on "loss" percentage is computed from the total number of contests considered or "games played". [The reason we use "loss" percentage rather than "win" percentage is because like all other scoring "rules" in the <u>UCWDC® *"Majority Rules" Scoring Format*</u> the lowest value number is considered the "best" score! All of these lower numbers will one day yield a single number called the *Vastel Value* which will be used to show 1 value displayed electronically to determine the order of an event contest's results].

To compute the true value of a contestant's "loss" percentage, the total number of "losses" must be divided by the total number of "games played". In the event that there are ties to be considered in the <u>wins/losses/ties</u> records, for the purpose of arriving at the true "loss" percentage value, each "tie" must be halved, yielding the value of ½ of a "win" and ½ of a "loss". In the example above, a record of 11-7-4 is actually computed as though the contestant had 13 wins and 9 losses, thus yielding a true "loss" percentage of ".409", while the record of 11-8-3 is computed as 12.5 wins and 9.5 losses, or a true "loss" percentage of ".432". The loss percentage of .409 is lower than the loss percentage of .432, thus a better loss percentage. The contestant with the smaller <u>loss percentage</u> number value is awarded the higher placement, if a tie for the best record does not persist. This is the only placement within the Dance awarded at this time. After awarding the best record, or if a tie persists, then proceed to Rule #8, part #3.

3. If the initial tie in question from Rule #7 was only between two contestants, then the second contestant with the lesser record will be awarded the next lower Dance placement. If the initial tie in question exists for more than two contestants for the same Dance placement and the tie for the highest Dance placement is broken at Rule #8, part #2, the remaining contestants will still be considered tied, but for the next lower Dance placement. At this time, a 'new' computation must be done for the remaining tied contestants, executing Rule #8, part #2 once again, thus negating the 'group' effect of the contestant that received the previous higher Dance placement (as now it is essentially considered a 'new' head-to-head competition between the remaining tied contestants).

This 'new' computation for the remaining tied contestants is a *'re-visitation'* of Rule #8, where part #2 is re-applied and re-calculated, and where the '<u>re-visitation</u>' will yield new <u>wins/losses/ties</u> records to be compared. This *'re-visitation'* process must be computed using Rule #8, part #2, with each successive awarding of a next lower Dance placement from the original 'group' of tied contestants, where there are still tied contestants that remain to be considered. Basically, if the original 'group' of tied contestants numbers 3, there will be 1 *'re-visitation'* process used, and if the original tied 'group' numbers 4, there will be 2 *'re-visitation'* processes used, and if the original tied 'group' numbers 5, there will be 3 *'re-visitation'* processes used, and on and on, until all tied contestants from the original tied 'group' are assigned, each in turn, the next lower Dance placement. If a tie persists for any 'group' of contestants that have the same exact <u>wins/losses/ties</u> record after Rule #8 is executed, then the tie between those contestants is considered 'final', therefore proceed Rule #8, part #4.

4. The contestants with a *final tie* share the Dance placements for which they are actually tied (for example, a 2-way tie for 2nd place are actually sharing the placements of 2nd and 3rd, and a 3-way tie for 5th place are actually sharing the placements of 5th, 6th, and 7th). However, in spite of the shared placements in the *final tie*, the contestants are officially announced as being awarded the higher Dance placement only, with the other shared Dance placements not announced or awarded (for example, if 2 contestants are tied for 3rd, thus sharing 3rd and 4th placements, they are both announced and awarded "3rd place", with the "4th place" not announced or awarded). The next placement announced and awarded would then be 5th place. This is similarly done for all tied placements in a *final tie*.

5. Each "single-dance" placement that applies to a division's defined Championship formula, equates to a *carry-forward* value used in Rule #9 (the first rule for determining results in a "multi-dance" contest). For example, a 1st place award receives a value of "1", a 2nd place a value of "2", a 3rd place a value of "3", and on and on, until all placements are assigned a *carry-forward* value.

6. If there is a *final tie*, calculate the *carry-forward* value for the tied contestants as follows: Total the shared placements of the tied contestants, and divide that total by the number of tied contestants, for example, if 2 contestants are tied for 3rd and 4th, the placements add up to "7", which is then divided by 2 (the number of tied contestants) to get a value of "3.5" to *carry-forward* as each of their placements for that dance in the division's Championship formula. If 3 contestants are tied for 3rd, 4th, and 5th, the sum of the placements is "12", divided by 3, which equals a *carry-forward* value of "4" for each tied contestant. If 4 contestants are tied for 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th, the sum of the placements is "18", divided by 4, which equals a *carry-forward* value of "4.5" for each tied contestant. In this way, tied contestants in a "single-dance" format are computed a *carry-forward* value that is the "average" of all placements under consideration for the tied contestants. The tied contestants, while being announced with the top placement under consideration, will only be awarded this "average" of placements in the "Multi-Dance" Championship formula, beginning at Rule #9.

Rule #9 – "Multi-Dance" Championship formulas, determining the *aggregate value* from Dance results:

1. To determine the "Multi-Dance" Championship division winners, each contestant receives a *carry-forward* value from each dance as determined by Rule #8. These values now remain unaltered, with each dance carrying the same weight as another dance in

the "Multi-Dance" Championship format (except for the "ascension" divisions of Showcase Masters, Showcase Crown, SuperStars, RisingStars, and Line Crown, where the value from each dance is multiplied by the 'weighted' formula according to the division's Championship criteria). [For these divisions just listed, the dances for Partner Dance: Waltz and Two Step, and the dances for Line Dance: Slow (adagio) and Fast (allegro), will each be counted as 30% of the final score, and in all cases the Solo Medley will be counted as 40% of the score.]

The first determination in scoring for any "Championship" title is to notate whether the division has a 1-dance championship, a 3-dance championship, a 4-dance championship, a 5-dance championship, a 6-dance championship, or an 8-dance championship (for example, an 8-dance ProAm Championship or ProPro Championship). For all Championships (except the 1-dance championship), this determines how many *carry-forward* values from pre-designated dance groups are to be added together to arrive at a contestant's *aggregate valu*e for a division's "Multi-Dance" Championship. [Other divisional "Championships" can occur when dances different than each division's "Grand Championship" formula are considered to create a 'mini' or 'maxi' set of dances that are contested for a differently titled, specialized award other than the division's major "Grand Championship".]

For example, to determine each contestant's Rule #9 *aggregate value* for a 5-dance Championship, total the *carry-forward* values for all qualifying dances, hence, *carry-forward* values of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 have an *aggregate value* of "15", or *carry-forward* values of 1, 2.5, 4, 5.5, 7 have an *aggregate value* of "20". In the 'weighted' format for listed "ascension" divisions above, Waltz and Two Step values for Partner Dance, and Dance A (Slow) and the Dance B (Fast) values for Line Dance, will be multiplied by a factor of 3, while the Solo Medley in all cases will be multiplied by a factor of 4, hence, *carry-forward* values of 1 and 2 for the first two dances will be "3" and "6", respectively, while a *carry-forward* value of 3 for the Solo Medley will be "12", yielding an *aggregate value* of "21".

2. Sort the *aggregate values* of all contestants, computed from all Championship qualifying dances for that division of competition, in ascending order, from the smallest number to the largest. The smaller number represents the best *aggregate value* (therefore the better average placement) for the qualifying dances included and is awarded the higher placement. The next larger number is awarded the next higher placement, and on and on, until all contestants in a division are assigned a unique Championship placement. If a tie persists after Rule #9 is fully executed, then proceed to Rule #10.

Rule #10 – 1st Tiebreaker for "Multi-Dance" Championship, determining Head-to-Head results computed as (*wins/losses/ties*) from *placements* across all *commonly competed-in* dances, with each Championship placement requiring *re-visitation*:

1. In Rule #9 (the first determination for any Championship result), note that the results were computed equally across all contestants in that division according to the division's 'championship' group formula. Now in Rule #10, in the event of a tie in the results from Rule #9, it is to be considered a competition only between those tied contestants, and the 'championship' group formula is no longer used in consideration. All dances that are 'mutually' performed by the tied contestants are now considered no matter their inclusion, or exclusion, in the 'championship' group formula used in Rule #9.

    Only *commonly competed-in* dances will be used in Rule #10. *Commonly competed-in* dances are defined as those dances where the tied contestants mutually danced against each other for placements without regard to the 'championship' group formula. These include all dances that were *commonly competed-in*, even those that were not part of the 'championship' group formula computed in Rule #9.

2. In case of a tie at Rule #9, only the tied contestants are now compared for *wins/losses/ties* between the contestants' placements in dances that are *commonly competed-in*. Within the group of tied contestants, a dance's placement for a specific contestant when compared with the placement for another tied contestant will either yield a *win*, or a *loss*, or a *tie* between the two contestants for that specific dance. That in turn will yield a record of *wins/losses/ties* across all tied contestants, each contestant against each other contestant in each *dance's placements*. Please note, in *wins/losses/ties* the "numeric" difference in the placements is not considered, but only whether it was a *win*, or a *loss*, or a *tie*. Like in other sports, the number of wins, losses, and ties against the competition reads like a record for the contestant in question, that is, 5 wins, 3 losses, and 0 ties reads as a record of 5-3-0, which then is higher than the record of 3-5-0, where more wins are attained by the first contestant. A record of 4-2-2, is higher than the record of 4-3-1, where fewer losses and more ties are attained by the first contestant. In all cases the total number of wins, losses, and ties for each contestant in the tied group should be the same. If this is not true, a scoring error has occurred, and the *wins/losses/ties* for Rule #10 should be re-calculated.

    While these above examples of contestant records are easy to comprehend, when the number of contests or "games played" is great and diverse, and ties are involved (with most likely 3 or more contestants tied, as sometimes happens in ProAm dance), then the placements can be visually difficult to determine. So, a numeric recording of *wins/losses/ties* will be done by computing either the *"win"* percentage, or the *"loss"* percentage, depending on whether the reporting is to show the "highest" or the "lowest" value as the best score in the reporting format. Reporting is shown as a 3-place decimal value [".yyy"], either as a *"win"* percentage or a *"loss"* percentage that when, for audit purposes, they are added together equals a total of "1.000". Where considering the highest *"win"* value, a ".667" is better than a ".600", and where considering the lowest *"loss"* value, a ".333" is better than a ".400". When computing either *"wins"*, *"losses"*, and *"ties"* into a numeric values, note that *"ties"* are a numeric 'push' between contestants and are therefore computed as *"half of a win"* and *"half of a loss"* where the total number of "games played" remains the same. When a 'partial' percentage occurs, the 3-place decimal value is either rounded up or down as the case may be, with a 'half' of a percentage point [".yyy5"] being rounded up for a "win" percentage, and rounded down for a "loss" percentage.

    For the *UCWDC® "Majority Rules" Scoring Format*, when the *wins/losses/ties* records of the tied contestants are compared, a new number based on "loss" percentage is computed from the total number of contests considered or "games played". [The reason we

use "loss" percentage rather than "win" percentage is because like all other scoring "rules" in the ***UCWDC® "Majority Rules" Scoring Format*** the lowest value number is considered the "best" score! All of these lower numbers will one day yield a single number called the *Vastel Value* which will be used to show 1 value displayed electronically to determine the order of an event contest's results].

To compute the true value of a contestant's "loss" percentage, the total number of "losses" must be divided by the total number of "games played". In the event that there are ties to be considered in the wins/losses/ties records, for the purpose of arriving at the true "loss" percentage value, each "tie" must be halved, yielding the value of ½ of a "win" and ½ of a "loss". In the example above, a record of 11-7-4 is actually computed as though the contestant had 13 wins and 9 losses, thus yielding a true "loss" percentage of ".409", while the record of 11-8-3 is computed as 12.5 wins and 9.5 losses, or a true "loss" percentage of ".432". The loss percentage of .409 is lower than the loss percentage of .432, thus a better "loss" percentage. The contestant with the smaller <u>loss percentage</u> number value is awarded the higher placement, if a tie for the best record does not persist. This is the only placement within the Championship awarded at this time. After awarding the best record, or if a tie persists, then proceed to Rule #10, part #3.

3. If the initial tie in question from Rule #9 was only between two contestants, then the second contestant with the lesser record will be awarded the next lower Championship placement. If the initial tie in question exists for more than two contestants for the same Championship placement and the tie for the highest Championship placement is broken at Rule #10, part #4, the remaining contestants will still be considered tied, but for the next lower Championship placement. At this time, the remaining tied contestants may have additional *commonly competed-in* dances that were not considered before because the previous contestant that was now awarded a higher Championship placement had not competed in those dances. If there are 'new' *commonly competed-in* dances to be considered, then those dances become part of a 'new' computation for that next lower Championship placement, executing Rule #10, part #4 once again. Regardless of whether 'new' *commonly competed-in* dances exist between the original tied contestants, this 'new' computation must be done for the remaining tied contestants, thus negating the 'group' effect of the contestant that received the previous higher Championship placement (as now it is essentially considered a 'new' head-to-head competition between the remaining tied contestants).

This 'new' computation for the remaining tied contestants is a *'re-visitation'* of Rule #10, where part #4 is re-applied and re-calculated, and where the *'re-visitation'* will yield new *wins/losses/ties* records to be compared. This *'re-visitation'* process must be computed using Rule #10, part #4, with each successive awarding of a next lower Championship placement from the original 'group' of tied contestants, where there are still tied contestants that remain to be considered. Basically, if the original 'group' of tied contestants numbers 3, there will be 1 *'re-visitation'* process used, and if the original tied 'group' numbers 4, there will be 2 *'re-visitation'* processes used, and if the original tied 'group' numbers 5, there will be 3 *'re-visitation'* processes used, and on and on, until all tied contestants from the original tied 'group' are assigned, each in turn, the next lower Championship placement. If a tie persists for any 'group' of contestants that have the same exact *wins/losses/ties* record after Rule #10 is executed, then proceed to Rule #11.

Rule #11 – 2nd Tiebreaker for "Multi-Dance" Championship, determining Head-to-Head results computed as (***wins/losses/ties***) from *individual judges' marks* across all ***commonly competed-in*** dances, with each Championship placement requiring ***re-visitation***:

1. Only *commonly competed-in* dances (that created the tie in Rule#10) will be used in Rule #11. *Commonly competed-in* dances are defined as those dances where the tied contestants mutually danced against each other for placements without regard to the 'championship' group formula. These include all dances that were *commonly competed-in*, even those that were not part of the 'championship' group formula computed in Rule #9.

2. In case of a tie at Rule #10, only the tied contestants are now compared for *wins/losses/ties* between the *individual judge's marks* in all dances that are *commonly competed-in*. Within the group of tied contestants, a judge's mark for a specific contestant for a specific dance when compared with the judge's mark for another tied contestant will either yield a *win*, or a *loss*, or a *tie* between the two contestants for that specific judge. That in turn will yield a record of *wins/losses/ties* across all tied contestants, each contestant against each other contestant in each *individual judge's marks*. Please note, in *wins/losses/ties* the "numeric" difference in the *individual judge's marks* is not considered, but only whether it was a *win*, or a *loss*, or a *tie*. Now each dance's record of *wins/losses/ties* from *judge's marks* for each of the tied contestants is totaled across all *commonly competed-in* dances that created the tie in Rule #10. This will yield an aggregate record of *wins/losses/ties* for each tied contestant. The *wins/losses/ties* records, once computed from *judge's marks* here in Rule #11 (rather than *dance's placements* in Rule #10), are valued and compared respectively (see comparative examples of records like listed in Rule #10, part #2). In all cases the total number of wins, losses, and ties for each contestant in the tied group should be the same. If this is not true, a scoring error has occurred, and the *wins/losses/ties* for Rule #11 should be re-calculated.

While the examples of contestant records (shown in Rule #10) are easy to comprehend, when the number of contests or "games played" is great and diverse, and ties are involved (with most likely 3 or more contestants tied, as sometimes happens in ProAm dance), then the placements can be visually difficult to determine. So, a numeric recording of *wins/losses/ties* may be done by computing either the *"win"* percentage, or the *"loss"* percentage, depending on whether the reporting is to show the "highest" or the "lowest" value as the best score in the reporting format. Reporting is shown as a 3-place decimal value [".zzz"], either as a *"win"* percentage or a *"loss"* percentage that when, for audit purposes, they are added together equals a total of "1.000". Where considering the highest *"win"* value, a ".667" is better than a ".600", and where considering the lowest *"loss"* value, a ".333" is better than a ".400". When computing either *"wins"*, *"losses"*, and *"ties"* into a numeric values, note that *"ties"* are a numeric 'push' between contestants and are therefore computed as *"half of a win"* and *"half of a loss"* where the total number of "games played" remains

the same. When a 'partial' percentage occurs, the 3-place decimal value is either rounded up or down as the case may be, with a 'half' of a percentage point [".zzz5"] being rounded up for a "win" percentage, and rounded down for a "loss" percentage.

For the *UCWDC® "Majority Rules" Scoring Format*, when the *wins/losses/ties* records of the tied contestants are compared, a new number based on "loss" percentage is computed from the total number of contests considered or "games played". [The reason we use "loss" percentage rather than "win" percentage is because like all other scoring "rules" in the *UCWDC® "Majority Rules" Scoring Format* the lowest value number is considered the "best" score! All of these lower numbers will one day yield a single number called the *Vastel Value* which will be used to show 1 value displayed electronically to determine the order of an event contest's results].

To compute the true value of a contestant's "loss" percentage, the total number of "losses" must be divided by the total number of "games played". In the event that there are ties to be considered in the *wins/losses/ties* records, for the purpose of arriving at the true "loss" percentage value, each "tie" must be halved, yielding the value of ½ of a "win" and ½ of a "loss". In the example above, a record of 11-7-4 is actually computed as though the contestant had 13 wins and 9 losses, thus yielding a true "loss" percentage of ".409", while the record of 11-8-3 is computed as 12.5 wins and 9.5 losses, or a true "loss" percentage of ".432". The loss percentage of .409 is lower than the loss percentage of .432, thus a better "loss" percentage. The contestant with the smaller *loss percentage* number value is awarded the higher placement, if a tie for the best record does not persist. This is the only placement within the Championship awarded at this time. After awarding the best record, or if a tie persists, then proceed to Rule #11, part #3.

3. If the initial tie in question from Rule #10 was only between two contestants, then the second contestant with the lesser record will be awarded the next lower Championship placement. If the initial tie in question exists for more than two contestants for the same Championship placement and the tie for the highest Championship placement is broken at Rule #11, part #2, the remaining contestants will still be considered tied, but for the next lower Championship placement. At this time, the remaining tied contestants may have additional *commonly competed-in* dances that were not considered before because the previous contestant that was now awarded a higher Championship placement had not competed in those dances. If there are 'new' *commonly competed-in* dances to be considered, then those dances now become part of a 'new' computation for that next lower Championship placement, executing Rule #11, part #2 once again. Regardless of whether 'new' *commonly competed-in* dances exist between the original tied contestants, this 'new' computation must be done for the remaining tied contestants, thus negating the 'group' effect of the contestant that received the previous higher Championship placement (as now it is essentially considered a 'new' head-to-head competition between the remaining tied contestants).

    Unlike Rules #8 or #10, where any 'new' computation for the remaining tied contestants is a *'re-visitation'* within Rules #8 or #10, respectively, for a Rule #11 tie, the *'re-visitation'* must go all the way back to Rule #10, where part #2 is re-applied and re-calculated, and where the '*re-visitation'* will yield new *wins/losses/ties* records to be compared. In this *'re-visitation'*, if there is still a tie after Rule #10, part #2, is executed, then the tie-breaking process moves on to Rule #11, part #2. When and if this *'re-visitation'* finally breaks the tie, first computing *wins/losses/ties* from Rule #10, part #4, and then, if needed, computing *wins/losses/ties* from Rule #11, part #2, there is then a successive awarding of a next lower Championship placement from the original 'group' of tied contestants, where there are still tied contestants that remain to be considered. Basically, if the original 'group' of tied contestants numbers 3, there will be 1 *'re-visitation'* process used, and if the original tied 'group' numbers 4, there will be 2 *'re-visitation'* processes used, and if the original tied 'group' numbers 5, there will be 3 *'re-visitation'* processes used, and on and on, until all tied contestants from the original tied 'group' are assigned, each in turn, the next lower Championship placement. If a tie persists for any 'group' of contestants that have the same exact *wins/losses/ties* record after Rule #11 is executed, then the tie between those contestants is considered 'final', therefore proceed to Rule #11, part #4.

4. The contestants with a *final tie* share the Championship placements for which they are actually tied (for example, a 2-way tie for 2nd place are actually sharing the placements of 2nd and 3rd, and a 3-way tie for 5th place are actually sharing the placements of 5th, 6th, and 7th). However, in spite of the shared placements in the *final tie*, the contestants are officially announced as being awarded the higher Championship placement only, with the other shared Championship placements not announced or awarded (for example, if 2 contestants are tied for 3rd, thus sharing 3rd and 4th placements, they are both announced and awarded "3rd place", with the "4th place" not announced or awarded). The next Championship placement announced and awarded would then be 5th place. This is similarly done for all tied placements in a *final tie*.

For any reason, if there is concern or lack of comprehension about the *UCWDC® "Majority Rules" Scoring **Format***, please contact the Scoring Sub-Committee chair, Dave Getty, at contestdirector@ucwdcworlds.com or text him please at +1 817 727-7745 (where text is also available internationally via "WhatsApp" at the same number on your smart phone). Realize that the Scoring Sub-Committee operates under the direction and supervision of the UCWDC Rules Committee, where the UCWDC Vice President of Rules, Beth Emerson, can be contacted at rules@ucwdc.org or text her please at +1 405 535-3073 (where text is also internationally available via "WhatsApp" at the same number on your smart phone).

Any Scoring System or Scrutineer that operates, or wishes to operate, the *UCWDC® "Majority Rules" Scoring **Format***, must maintain contact with the UCWDC Rules Committee, and its Scoring Sub-Committee, to readily and responsibly stay current with any alterations or additions to the Scoring Format algorithms. Any 'new' Scoring System or Scrutineer must be trained and tested by an assigned UCWDC Scoring Examiner that will authenticate complete accuracy, and hence, authorize the work for use by any UCWDC Sanctioned Event. Additional conditions or mandates for Scoring Systems or Scrutineers may occur over time, that must be addressed and completed by a declared date to retain their "license" to operate within the UCWDC. If there are in any regard, questions that need answered, please contact at your convenience.